

the woman's sexual advances, first by not allowing her to prolong her conversations, and second by preserving a 'duly cool demeanour towards her' (37).

Workman's thesis is finally stated in a rhetorical question: 'Does a rational psychology forbid belief in the conjuncture of emotional-religious insanity, and a disturbed condition of the sexual economy?' (40). Yet the way Workman phrases his thesis seems deliberately misleading, since the real question must be not whether the implications of these cases are compatible with science, but whether they are compatible with religion or at least contemporary notions of it. The later rephrasing of the question belies what it is that Workman really doubts: 'Is the idea opposed to the revelations of Physiology, or Pathology?' (40). Workman's idea is more emphatically opposed to the 'revelations' of religion, as he accounts for 'religious insanity' in such a way that it could be taken for religion itself, essentially because he never clarifies precisely where religious behaviour ends and religious insanity begins.^{xxxx}

The idea of there being any connection at all seems rooted in the notion that the relationship of mind and body is, at least when working well, a 'continually perfecting process' (40). Workman cites authorities on 'Psycho-somatics' like Professor Lazarus, and 'the late lamented Griesenger' (40). But he seems to anticipate some sort of clash with religious authority when, even as he encourages colleagues to persevere at 'Psycho-somatics', he warns them to 'shut out all other considerations than our unwavering allegiance to truth' (41). Those 'other considerations' must have been considerable.

Otherwise, he would not have found it necessary to conclude by arguing that, provided of course that some sort of 'psycho-somatic' connection really exists, its religious/sexual corollary actually indicates 'divine forethought' (41). Some sort of connection between man's religious capacity and his 'procreative organization' (41) is precisely what separates him from beasts. Normally such a connection serves as an invisible control; however, 'under changed conditions' (42), the religious connection becomes only too obvious. Thus Workman defends the connection between religion and sexual disorder, on the grounds that it is an aberration of a connection that is always present but usually, because of its benignancy, unnoticed. This is perfectly consistent with Workman's thesis, expressed earlier in the same article, that 'the vices of humanity seem to be but perverted, or badly educated virtues' (35).